

From: Danielle Zam
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 6:14 AM
Subject: Don't to it-2002 Biennial Regulatory Review

Aloha,

I am a woman who lives in Hawaii. And I just got through watching Nightline. I heard/saw that you plan on putting through the vote to allow more cross-ownership, or in other words as they said on the show-CONSOLIDATION of the media.

I believe that with more companies involved in the media, I can feel good about what I am watching, just like I do now. I can channel surf and see all sorts of different views on one topic.

On my morning drive to work, there are only three radio stations that I really consider/like to listen to. If one company owned all of them, what would I listen to? And what would I hear? I live in America, I should have choices.

Maybe you say that the laws or rules are old and don't work today. Well, imagine the United States a decade or two from now. TV, music, etc, are all real time. Fewer companies are controlling what I watch, hear or maybe even feel due to what I watch. I see a purse on a show similar to Friends. I am able to take my TV's MOUSE, click on the purse and immediately buy it over the web/TV. Imagine the implications of that? What if I want to go to a particular University, and I need books? Well, maybe there are commercials on this sort of thing so I can click on it, and get to buy that one book I need. Do you get the picture? Who is making all the money? I am sure you know it won't be walmart. Do we really want that?

In the future I don't want to see a washed out version of something that "I" deem important, but due to fewer companies having more media coverage, which means that what "they" deem important will be all over the place, giving them control over my viewing.

Imagine the iraq war on many stations, all showing the same reporters, pictures, etc. Will I want to watch TV as much?, with fewer choices to view?

I don't think so. It would be boring, so all those big companies hoping to make money with their commercials won't get their message across to me as they do now.

I see the FCC as a very big organization that has weight in what it says. Sort of like that stock broker commercial they used to play a few years back. When talks, people listen. Will it stay that way with fewer players having more at stake while controlling the buck?

A humble opinion from a concerned citizen.

From: Miner Randy-ERM035
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 7:29 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Mr. Martin,

As a citizen concerned about free speech, I remind you that the airwaves belong to the people and not the corporations or political parties. Please do not deregulate the media as this will result in only one viewpoint being heard and will not serve our democracy. We need more regulation, not less. The media is too influential in its ability to brainwash people using well-known principles of psychology. It must not be left to the "free market" to decide.

thank you for considering this view, shared by many, many others as well as myself.

Regards,

R. Miner

=====
| Randy Miner
Senior Software Engineer, GTDG group.
Motorola, Inc. Location: FL08 CGISS sector
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33322
Mail Stop: 1359 Room 1190 Cubicle 4-1017

| randy.miner@motorola.com
| Voice: (954)723-4471
| Page: (954)723-4567 pin 8050
| Home Page: <http://www-fl08.comm.mot.com/~minerran/>
=====

From: Havay, John
To: amhavay, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 7:51 AM
Subject: RE: Your job is to look out for the public's best interest. Protest US

I agree 100 percent

john

-----Original Message-----

From: amhavay [mailto:amhavay@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2003 12:12 AM
To: kjmweb@fcc.gov; mcopps@fcc.gov; kabernat@fcc.gov; mpowell@fcc.gov; jadelste@fcc.gov
Subject: Your job is to look out for the public's best interest. Protest US

FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell:
mpowell@fcc.gov
FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy:
kabernat@fcc.gov
FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps:
mcopps@fcc.gov
FCC Commissioner Kevin J. Martin:
kjmweb@fcc.gov
FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein:
jadelste@fcc.gov

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing you to please protest our air waves from growing even small. It seems to me that the balance of power keeps tipping in one direction. At some point the scale will crash and all will tumble off and both sides will lose. Your job is to look out for the public's best interest. To protest the largest group for the most good. I urge you to vote down these changes.

Angela Havay

1430 Chetwynd Ave

Plainfield, NJ 07060

From: Jim Hollister
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 8:14 AM
Subject: Our airwaves

I'm writing to you to encourage you to do two things:

1. Don't relax the restrictions on media ownership. In fact, please encourage more diversity in TV and radio. There isn't enough now.
2. Set aside free airtime for political campaigning. The current political fundraising (to buy advertising time) is corrupting our government.

Thank you.

Jim Hollister
2006 Chaparral Drive
Round Rock, TX

From: ar
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 8:33 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Chairman Michael K. Powell
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
Commissioner Michael J. Copps
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

Deregulation on the radio industry has had a devastating effect for radio loving Americans. That a very few companies control 70 percent of radio marketplace in most areas is not acceptable.

Do not approve new rules on June 2 that would ease the current limitations on ownership for newspapers, radio and television stations.
Allowing one company to own more than one media outlet in the same market is not acceptable to the American people.

I urge you to vote NO!

Ann Reaves

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: RNcalledEd@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 8:46 AM
Subject: Keep Our Airwaves Diverse!!!

Dear Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

It is with great concern that I write you today. The changes being considered which would allow immediate and near total absorption of the small broadcasters into a few conglomerates is NOT in the best interest of our nation. Television and newspapers (both print and on-line) are, and will continue to be, the major sources of news for the majority of our citizens. It is vital to the preservation of Freedom of the Press to keep regulations in place which prevent any great amount of the total available media in one area to fall into the hands of one corporation.

Yes, it would be more efficient if the large monolithic companies, with multimedia capabilities, took over dissemination of the news. This would, however, almost ensure that the variety of viewpoints currently available would drop dramatically. A Constitutional guarantee of Freedom of the Press becomes virtually worthless if smaller news sources can no longer compete, either failing or being absorbed by the giants.

Fewer sources translate directly into a lesser-informed public. The recent example of the war in Iraq shows this. The system of imbedding reporters made news dissemination easier, but it also allowed the military tighter control of what went out over the airwaves. This was evidenced by comparing the stories on CNN from both Gulf Wars. CNN's reporting this year was very bland compared to the images and gritty reporting we got back in the first Gulf War. They seemed, in fact, to be very unwilling to report on any situation which reflected negatively on the military or the Bush Administration. All of the American news sources toned down any criticism of the military or government in order to stay on their good side.

I watched several foreign networks during the heavy fighting, and they did a better job of showing the negative effects of the war as well as the positive angles. It seemed that the foreign services remembered what CNN had forgot: that the press must always be a watchdog, and must be willing to bite the hand that feeds it when necessary. To see the mainstream news cozying up to the Administration and the military, in my opinion, undermined their integrity, and made the news sources more vulnerable to being manipulated or coerced into presenting an almost propaganda-like agenda of favorable stories.

This total control of the news by the military and the State department gave us a foreshadowing of what could happen in the future across the more general spectrum of U.S. media. The military forced the news service "watchdogs" to feed on the scraps they allowed out, thus corrupting them to a certain degree. We saw the President basically insist that any criticism of the government in time of crisis was *Un-American*. This alone was enough to create an atmosphere of fear among those groups who wanted to oppose the war.

Let us suppose that in some near future scenario we had a President who was willing to use even stronger coercion to strong-arm the press. If the reporting of news is concentrated into just a few hands, and those hands are convinced or coerced into toeing some party line, then huge abuses of power could occur with the citizens being none the wiser. A truly corrupt leader could use such control to turn our government into a police state. Think it can't happen? Read the history of the rise of Lenin. He who controls the media controls public opinion, and ultimately the nation.

Please do not throw away the ultimate tool that keeps Americans free and the government more-or-less honest. A free press depends on the ability of the smaller media companies to survive. A system allowing almost unlimited mergers and market share control is antithetical to that freedom.

Sincerely,
Edward D. Nims, RN

From: Mariellen Harland
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 9:30 AM
Subject: FREEDOM OF PRESS

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW MORE CONSOLIDATION TO OCCUR!!!! PROTECT OUR FREEDOM OF PRESS

From: The Goldens
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 9:41 AM
Subject: Re: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings (Thankyou for your message concerning medi

I sent you an e-mail asking you to take me off your list thinking I was now on someones "badger" list. I realize you were acknowledging my letter. Sorry.

From: Michelle Conroy
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 9:49 AM
Subject: Monday's commission meeting

Dear Commissioners,

I recently became aware, through ABC's Nightline, about the changes that are being voted upon this coming Monday, June 2. I wanted to write and express my concern about the impact these changes could have on media in this country. As it stands currently, I have trouble finding a mainstream broadcaster that is anything but mainstream. Most of the major broadcast companies, owned by very few conglomerates, are seemingly afraid to depart from the standard patriotic view of the country and avoid world perspective altogether. I find it sad that to get an honest report on the impact of US actions, I need to watch, read or listen to foreign broadcasts. While I still hold out hope that eventually pursuit of the truth in American journalism will return, I am afraid that the changes possibly made on Monday will make that possibility more and more remote. Allowing national media to take over local news sources robs the American people, particularly those in small town America, from the views that really matter to them. A decrease in the diversity of our news sources, decreases our awareness as citizens in this world. Not to mention the potential implications, if one or several of these media conglomerates decides to back a particular political candidate or party. The implications of these changes are appalling. For those reasons, and the long term integrity of American media these changes can not be allowed to pass. It is my sincerest hope that as commissioners you will not take these changes lightly. It is your duty and responsibility to make a decision that is good for the American people, I beg with you to realize that this is not best for the American people, and indeed will prove detrimental. Thank you for reading my thoughts. I wish you luck and clarity when making many of the difficult decisions you face.

Sincerely,
Michelle Conroy
Graduate Student
University of Rochester
Rochester, NY 14627

From: Steve Thornbury
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 10:12 AM
Subject: Re: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings (Thank

Reply to: Re: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings (Tha
Dear Mr. Copps

I saw a portion of your statement on C-SPAN the other day. I wish I had taped it so I could replay it every time I'm forced to sit through yet another perfunctory, rambling, cliché-ridden speech from a prominent individual. Your presentation was the very model of clarity and an object lesson for anyone who wishes to communicate effectively. Keep up the good work.

-Steve Thornbury

Michael Copps wrote:

>Thank you for your message concerning media consolidation. I am happy to know
>that you are participating in the debate over this issue and hope that you
>will continue to do so in the weeks leading up to the June 2 vote and
>thereafter. We must come to grips with this issue because it is so important
>not only for the kinds of entertainment we get from our media, but also from
>the standpoint of what it means for the news and information that sustains our
>country's democratic dialogue. I hope you will talk about this issue with
>your friends, neighbors, local media and government officials. Again, thanks
>for getting in touch.

>

>

>

>RFC822 header

>-----

>

> RECEIVED: from SF_Database by POP_Mailbox_-1157920176 ; 29 MAY 03 09:58:40 UT

> Received: from GATEKEEPER2.FCC.GOV by 192.168.1.6

> with SMTP (QuickMail Pro Server for MacOS 1.1.2); 29-May-2003 >09:58:23 -0400

> Received: by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov; id JAA27495; Thu, 29 May 2003 09:57:19 >-0400 (EDT)

> Received: from unknown(165.135.240.60) by gatekeeper2.fcc.gov via smap (V5.5)

> id xmaa27421; Thu, 29 May 03 09:57:06 -0400

> Received: from P2PXGS01.fccnet.win.fcc.gov ([165.135.240.36]) by >P2PXCS01.fccnet.win.fcc.gov
with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.4453);

> Thu, 29 May 2003 09:55:17 -0400

> MIME-Version: 1.0

> Content-Type: text/plain;

> charset="us-ascii"

> Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

> content-class: urn:content-classes:message

> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3

> Subject: Re: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings (Thank >you for your message
concerning medi

> Date: Thu, 29 May 2003 09:53:00 -0400

> Message-ID: ><ECF95347C2F284478874D906A2C0C8200670839C@P2PXGS01.fccnet.win.fcc.gov>

> Thread-Topic: Re: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings >(Thank you for your
message concerning medi

> Thread-Index: AcMl6iwKjtrwZV6vS0u2wzhu6N0Zfg==

> From: "Michael Copps" <MCOPPS@fcc.gov>

> To: <steve.thornbury@lao-adv.com>

> X-OriginalArrivalTime: 29 May 2003 13:55:17.0751 (UTC) >FILETIME=[EFD02870:01C325E9]

>

From: Nana
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjrnweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 10:17 AM
Subject: take_action

FCC Chairman Michael Powell argues that current media ownership restrictions are no longer necessary in today's expanded media landscape of satellite TV and Internet.

WHAT'S MICHAEL POWELL MAKING HIS DECISION ON??????????

But the study shows that: even as TV channels have proliferated, the amount of original and educational children's programming has not. Indeed, all the additional channels have done is provide additional channels for broadcasting the same programming, thus increasing market share at the expense of kids.

MICHAEL POWELL THINKS HE'S SOMEBODY???? TO MAKE SUCH A DECISION FOR E V E R Y B O D Y???

The FCC is supposed to represent public concern, so if enough people voice opposition, a massive blow to children's programming could be avoided.

SO... HOW DOES MICHAEL POWELL'S NOODLE THINKING REPRESENT PUBLIC CONCERN???

I'M VOICING MY O P P O S I T I O N!!!!!!

DON'T DELIVER THIS M A S S I V E B L O W TO CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING...

Nan J. Taylor, nanjt@myexcel.com THANK YOU.

http://www.common sense media.org/information/take_action.php

From: Lenkv1@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 10:31 AM
Subject: Re: deregulation hearings

Daar Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein:

I'm writing to express my views about the current push to deregulate. Have you seen some of the garbage and mis-information pushed into the brains of our children through the media? As a parent and a teacher, I am truly concerned about concentrating power into the hands of a few, wealthy, media owners.... Local stations ought to be able to say, "no, we will not air this....because it undermines democracy, because it undermines our values, because it's false, etc." whatever.... These local, independents should remain to balance what is being foisted on us by the giant, media moguls. Please consider children and parents when making your decision. Thank you. sincerely, Vivienne Lenk

From: Michael Tincher
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 10:40 AM
Subject: Re:Delay the June 2 hearing

Sirs:

Please do not change the FCC rules on media consolidation without full public debate. This is the most serious matter, as serious as war, currently before the American people. The growing public interest in this matter deserves time for the public to recover from the dominance of the war in their attention. I, for one, am becoming angrier and angrier at the apparent disregard of public interest in an action like this.

Michael Tincher
Santa Fe, NM

From: Will Roermernann
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Jun 8, 2003 2:33 PM
Subject: Bad Decision

I would suggest that you reverse your recent ruling that degrades the free communications market and put power into the hands of very few. Please do not cloud this issue; I realize that money rules, but please allow the people of these United States the freedoms guaranteed to us by the Constitution.

Will Roermernann

Will@ToneAmps.com

02-217

May 26, 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Commissioner
Michael J. Copps
1919 M St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Copps,

Regarding the proposal to relax media ownership rules I would like to urge you to disregard the arguments of the proponents of deregulation.

Concentration should be strengthened to uphold the present rules and regulations and perhaps enhance their authority in favoring a better "Free Press " regulation.

At the present time the philosophy is to gain a monopoly ownership of the mass media into the hands of those who want to control what the public knows and does not know. This is hardly a "Free Press " situation. There is now in place among the present media conglomerates the ability to reject news contrary to their political views. This is not a good situation. If the present rules are relaxed the situation will only get worse.

One of the primary concerns of the Federal Communications Commission is to prevent this from happening.

I would urge you to vote to retain the the present rules and direct the media conglomerates to accept and equally disseminate information from both sides of and argument.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jay D. Anderson
1197 E. Center Ave.
Carlsbad, N.M. 88220

02-277

Rita Swyers
2000 Eastside Road
Hood River, OR 97031
541-386-4961

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

5-26-03

I am so concerned. Please do not change "Broadcast Ownership Rules" that will allow giant media conglomerates to have an even bigger share of television and radio stations across our nation. I beg you to consider the people that depend on radio and TV for their information. Let's keep it open and fair.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

**Rita Swyers
2000 Eastside Road
Hood River, OR 97031**

02-277

From: Mike Sandiland
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 10:56 AM
Subject: NO

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

Sir,

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

No to relaxing the rules regarding corporate ownership of our public airways!!!

Cordially, Mike Sandiland, President
Crown Plaza Executive Office Suites
mike@crownoffices.com
(360) 733-0185

02-277
RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

From: Jim Sabastian
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 11:11 AM
Subject: Thank you

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Thank You for speaking out against the change of rules of ownership. I work in the news media in one of Murdock's new duopolies in NYC. He has already started combining both stations, and he started doing it almost immediately after the purchase of Chris Craft. Even though he knew that the FCC ruling allowing the merger was "temporary" and that he had to spin off one of his properties within 2 years, but he acted as if the "temporary" ruling was official. He acted as if he knew that the duopoly would hold knowing the political climate in favor of big business was alive and well in DC. I think he and Mel of Viacom/CBS knew exactly what they were doing when they purchased their media outlets that they would get passed the 35 % cap. PLEASE stop them.

Thanks,
Jim Sabastian

RECEIVED

From: Carol Lee Hilewick, PH.D.
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 11:11 AM
Subject: Proposed rulemaking

JUN 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am opposed to the FCC taking any further action which would allow corporations to expand their holdings in the mass and other media for the purpose of consolidating holdings in local or state markets. There are too few voices now.

I have a PH.D. in communications from the University of Minnesota and have worked in USG, industry, and academic positions in telecommunications and information policy. I held my first job as a journalist in Cleveland, Ohio when I was in my high school years. (Yes, there were such programs.)

As a consumer of print and broadcast media, I am appalled by the diminishment in quality and in content. I am disgusted (not too strong a word, on reflection) by watching an allegedly TV news show which promotes the cable offering, films, and other products of the ownership/conglomerate of the TV station. The emphasis on vertical and horizontal integration in this industry is limiting access to newsworthy material, both international and domestic. The shameless promotion of "stars", whether individuals, shows, or products leaves me with the opinion that most of what I now hear in the "news" cannot be trusted for newsgathering, content, context, or editing.

I no longer respect or trust any US media to any significant degree because of the pandering to corporate goals vs. public interest. Your proposed changes do not change this opinion. I have lived in a Latin American country for nearly five years where media ownership was part of family and corporate conglomerates. News standards were horribly compromised.

While the technologies have changed substantially since most of the current rules were made, the nature of human greed has not. Yes, a balance between cash flow and the cost of penetration of any medium is a consideration. The access to the radio waves remains, however, in my opinion a public trust. It is the job of the Commissioners of the FCC to protect the public wealth, that is, the air waves, and the public trust.

The Commissioners need to balance the cost of national communication structures and the need for "last mile" penetration. You should not be rolling over for the well-heeled and for those who do not honor the public trust. Indeed, because of their wealth and position, such industry leaders must be laughing all the way to the bank on the rising waves of sold-out public trust.

From: Larz Hitchcock
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 11:31 AM
Subject: Do what is right! This effects the public!

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioners Powell, Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein,

I urge you postpone your June 2nd Broadcast Ownership Biennial Review vote and immediately release the full text of the proposals you are considering regarding regulation of the media.

This is an issue of far-reaching public consequence and as such deserves a full and fair public review. The airwaves belong to the American people. Any decisions regarding their use and regulation should be made in the full light of public discourse and consideration.

Both the content and the process associated with these proposals represent a contradiction of the purpose of the FCC to ensure the American people access to as broad a spectrum of information as possible.

Currently, Chairman Powell is using the congressionally mandated 'Broadcast Ownership Biennial Review' as a rationale for not postponing this vote despite the requests of a bipartisan majority of the Commerce Committee, 150 members of Congress, two FCC Commissioners and over 200,000 Americans to do so.

I am curious how many members of Congress would have to contact you before you feel relieved of a Congressional mandate to vote on these proposals before telling the American people exactly what they are and what their ramifications would be.

In Chairman Powell's press release of May 15th 2003 denying Commissioners' Adelstein's and Copps' request to postpone this vote and release the full text of the proposals, he stated that, "Media ownership rules are intended to protect and advance the cherished values of diversity, localism and competition." (and) "...to promote core First Amendment values." In light of this statement, I am also curious how many citizens have to contact you requesting public release of information before you feel obliged to do so.

Thank you for your time and for taking the best interests and overwhelming input of the American people as your priority over the financial interests of the media industry by delaying this vote and releasing the full text of these proposals for public scrutiny and discussion.

From: D. Davis
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 11:41 AM
Subject: No Reform

I am opposed to media reform/deregulation. The concentration of owners is already too high. A perfect example of what this concentration fosters is the fact that there has been no local television news coverage regarding this issue in the Houston market. They are already selective in what they want us to hear. This will only get worse with reform/deregulation that favors big business. This is one area where regulation is a good thing.

D. L. Davis

From: C ryan
To: Michael Copps
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 11:53 AM
Subject: 02-277

Dear Sir,

We have followed in dismay the FCC actions regarding 02-277. This country is built on a diversity of opinion and expression that we feel is being threatened by your promise of approving this action that will allow for more tightly controlled media and dissemination of information and coverage of world and national events. We are writing to urge that you open this to public debate and scrutiny and not rush headlong into making such an important decision that will affect us from here on out.

The majority of Americans do not support this. It is your job to represent us, the people.

Thank you,
Casey & Kristin Ryan
Santa Fe, New Mexico

From: Kenneth B Jopp
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 12:02 PM
Subject: Re: Media Ownership Policy Reexamination

Dear Commissioner

I've attempted to use the FCC site's ECFS link with frustrating results. In fact I have been excluded from making my comments heard. Please urge Powell to postpone any final decisions until there is adequate public, as opposed to corporate , input.
Thanks,
Ken Jopp

From: Jerry Gepner
To: Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 29, 2003 12:06 PM
Subject: Upcoming Decisions

Dear Commissioners Copps & Adelstein,

I am writing to add my voice to the ongoing debate regarding media ownership. I realize that this issue is coming to a vote next week, but would like to take the opportunity to make you aware of my opinion as you consider your position. I have been involved in the media industry for my entire professional career which has spanned over two decades. During that time I have had the good fortune to be involved with many of the changes and advancements in the live teleproduction industry. That aside, I am writing this as a private citizen and not as a professional in the media industry and my views are personal and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of my company or it's ownership.

One of the great differentiators between the American media and that of many other countries is the breadth of diversity that we enjoy. I believe that by increasing the ownership capabilities for the major media corporations in this country will severely limit both the entrepreneurial spirit and the variety of content available to consumers. I have had the good fortune to be able to found a technology company based on a good idea and a lot of hard work. The company was successful because individuals (both investors and employees) were free to pursue their dreams and express their beliefs. This spirit is part of what keeps our society so strong, even in the face of daunting economic and societal challenges. By providing the opportunity for relatively unchecked and unmanaged growth by the largest of the media conglomerates, it is likely that the opportunity for that spirit to thrive will be severely limited. As the television broadcast industry approaches the watershed year of 2006 where DTV compliance is mandated, there will likely be some market reorganization and restructuring due to the requirements imposed by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. As this process moves forward, the opportunity for new and different broadcasters to join the community will occur. If, you allow the giant media companies to expand their station ownership in virtually every major market, you will limit the opportunity for new entities to engage in the business of broadcasting. I believe that the American public will have been done a tremendous disservice. One need only look at the recent coverage of our war with Iraq to understand how similar the current broadcast entities have become. Despite the various slogans, the network news outlets all engaged in identical coverage with identical information. Granted much of the information flow was controlled by the military (as is typical in times of military conflict), but there was virtually no alternative to the "talking head"/"retired general" format. There were no open forums, town meetings or other less pedantic methods of exploring and explaining events. The only real refuge for people who wanted to engage in an informed discussion were some Internet forums and listening to NPR.

In conclusion, I ask you to vote not to allow expansion of ownership at this time. Let the DTV transition work it's will on the television community first, before allowing expansion of ownership. I believe that the impact of this legislation, if truly enforced, will spur the growth of and help revitalize the American broadcast industry far more than allowing giant multimedia companies to acquire more stations.

Thank you for your attention and the opportunity to contact you.

Jerry N. Gepner
Doylestown, PA